Amendments to the Drawings:

The attached sheet of drawings includes changes to Fig. 1. This sheet, which includes Fig. 1, replaces the original sheet including Fig. 1.

Attachment: Replacement Sheet

REMARKS/ARGUMENTS

Claims 12-21 are pending in this application, with claims 12, 15, and 20 being the only independent claims. Claims 1-11 are canceled without prejudice or disclaimer. New claims 12-21 are now presented.

Objections to the Specification

The title of the application is objected to because the Examiner states that the title is not descriptive. The title is amended to be more descriptive of the claimed invention.

The disclosure is also objected to because the Examiner states that headings are missing. The specification has been amended to include headings.

Accordingly, the objection to the specification should now be withdrawn.

Objections to the Drawings

The drawings are objected to because Fig. 1 lacks text labeling. Fig. 1 is amended to include text labeling. Accordingly, the objection to the drawings should be withdrawn.

Rejections under 35 U.S.C. §112

Claim 10 stands rejected under 35 U.S.C. §112, first paragraph, and claims 1-11 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. §112, second paragraph, as being indefinite. Claim 1-11 are canceled. New claims 12-21 address the each of the Examiner concerns. Accordingly, the rejections under 35 U.S.C. §112, should now be withdrawn.

Rejections under 35 U.S.C. §103

Claims 1-6 and 10 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103 as unpatentable over U.S. Pub. No. 2002/0004826 (Waite) in view of U.S. Pub. No. 2004/0177171 (Ozaki).

Claims 7 and 11 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103 as unpatentable over Waite and Ozaki and further in view of U.S. Pub. No. 2004/0133775 (Callas).

Claims 8 and 9 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103 as unpatentable over Waite and Ozaki and further in view of U.S. Pub. No. 2006/0052087 (Tuunanen).

Before discussing the cited prior art and the Examiner's rejections of the claims in view of that art, a brief description of the subject matter described in the present application is deemed appropriate to facilitate understanding of the arguments for patentability. The description is not meant to argue unclaimed subject matter.

The present invention relates to a method, a system, and a name server for the transmission of communications from a first data transmission network to a second receiving data transmission network. According to an embodiment of the present invention, the first network has a control element S and a local name server D (see Fig. 1 and page 5, lines 10-26). The second network has a contact point I that functions as an access point to the second network (see page 5, lines 5-8) and a name server PD which stores network addresses of the internal elements of the operator network (see page 5, lines 29-32).

According to an embodiment of the present invention, when a subscriber of the first network sends a SIP INVITE message to a subscriber of the second network the control element S queries the local name server D of the first network and the local name server in turn queries the private name server PD of the second network for the address of the contact point I of the second network (see page 6, lines 10-18). After receiving the address from the private name server, the local name server D forwards the information to the control element S which then transmits the communication to the contact point I of the second network (page 6, lines 18-21). The contact point I operates as an access point to the second network and routes the communication to the intended subscriber.

According to the present invention, the local name server D of the first network is required to store only the network address of the private name server PD of the second network.

Independent claim 12 recites "generating a query for a network address of the required access point of the second operator network, the query being directed to the first name server", "transmitting the query from the first name server to the second name server of the second operator network", and "transmitting a query response including only the network address of the required access point from the second name server to a control element of the first operator network."

Waite fails to disclose the above limitations because Waite does not relate to inter-operator network connections. Waite relates to methods and systems for securely delivering electronic mail to hosts having dynamic IP addresses. According to Waite, a receiving mail server 101 receives a dynamic IP address and registers the dynamic IP address with a dynamic name server 102 (see paragraph [0035] of Waite). When the receiving mail server 101 requests mail delivery for a domain name from a delivering mail server 103, the delivering mail server requests the name of the server from a private name server 104, and the private name server transmits a record linking the domain name and the receiving mail server code to the delivering mail server (see paragraph [0037], lines 1-9 and 20-23). The delivery mail server 103 then transmits a request for the dynamic IP address to the private name server 104, which requests the dynamic IP address from the dynamic name server 102 (paragraph [0037], lines 23-26 and 29-33). The dynamic name server 102 transmits the IP address to the private name server 104, which sends it to the delivering mail server 103, and the delivering mail server delivers the mail to the receiving mail server (para. [0037], lines 33-43).

Waite fails to teach or suggest anything about a private name server that stores an address of an access point of an operator network for receiving communications from another operator network. Accordingly, Wait fails to disclose, teach or suggest "generating a query for a network

address of the required access point of the second operator network, the query being directed to the first name server", "transmitting the query from the first name server to the second name server of the second operator network", and "transmitting a query response including only the network address of the required access point from the second name server to a control element of the first operator network", as expressly recited in independent claim 12.

The combination of Waite and Ozaki also fails to teach or suggest the above limitations. Fig. 1 of Ozaki discloses a network system in which a plurality of Internet service providers are connected to a plurality of Local Area Networks or Intranets (see paragraph [0035] of Ozaki). According to Ozaki, a message processing device 200 is connectable to the various different networks and handles emails destined for a plurality of e-mail addresses possessed by the user (see paragraph [0037]). However, Ozaki fails to teach or suggest querying a name server of a network for a network address of an access point. Accordingly, the combination of Waite and Ozaki fails to disclose, teach or suggest "generating a query for a network address of the required access point of the second operator network, the query being directed to the first name server", "transmitting the query from the first name server to the second name server of the second operator network", and "transmitting a query response including only the network address of the required access point from the second name server to a control element of the first operator network", as expressly recited in independent claim 12.

The additional references of Callas and Tuunanen, cited by the Examiner in the rejections of original claims 7-9 and 11, also fail to disclose the recited limitations. Callas merely discloses that a mail server can be a LDAP server and Tuunanen discloses an IMS network for delivering messages. However, Callas and Tuunanen fail to disclose, teach or suggest anything about a

12

name server being queried for a network address of a network access point. Thus, independent claim 12 is also allowable over Waite and Ozaki in further view of Calles and Tuunanen.

Independent claims 15 and 20 are directed to a method and a name server, respectively, and include limitations similar to the above limitations of independent claim 12. Accordingly, independent claims 15 and 20 should be allowable for at least the same reasons as is independent claim 12.

Dependent claims 13-14, 16-19, and 21 are allowable for the same reasons as are independent claims 12, 15, and 20, as well as for the additional recitations contained therein.

The application is now deemed to be in condition for allowance, and early notice to that effect is solicited.

Should the Examiner have any remaining comments, questions, suggestions, or objections, the Examiner is respectfully requested to telephone the undersigned in order to resolve any outstanding issues.

It is believed that no fees or charges are required at this time in connection with the present application. However, if any fees or charges are required at this time, they may be charged to our Patent and Trademark Office Deposit Account No. 03-2412.

Respectfully submitted,
COHEN PONTANI LIEBERMAN & PAVANE LLP

By ___/Alfred W. Froebrich/_____
Alfred W. Froebrich
Reg. No. 38,887
551 Fifth Avenue, Suite 1210
New York, New York 10176
(212) 687-2770

Dated: October 20, 2009